

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,864	02/23/2004	Manfred Ueberschar	VOI0211.US	7576
7590 05/05/2009 Todd T. Taylor		EXAMINER		
Taylor & Aust, P.C.			BAREFORD, KATHERINE A	
142 S Main St P.O. Box 560			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Avilla, IN 467	10		1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/783,864	UEBERSCHAR ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
Katherine A. Bareford	1792					

	Katherine A. Bareford	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 24 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance of	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TW				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period is the date for purposes of determining the period under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of these for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a on NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		.,,					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 24-33.35.38.39.41-44 and 46. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	before or on the date of films a Na	tion of Annualill not	be entered				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
	/Katherine A. Bareford/	-it 4702					
	Primary Examiner, Art U	IIIL 1/92					

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the 35 USC 112 rejection of claim 40 only is overcome by the cancellation of claim 40.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: as to the 35 USC 103 rejection of the claims, the Examiner has reviewed applicant's arguments, however, the rejection is maintained. Applicant has provided arguments that none of the cited references provides the enclosing of a space as claimed and the providing of a negative pressure/positive pressure in the space or the placement of the pressure differential device. As well, applicant argues that the wall of Finnicum teaches away from the enclosement step. Applicant also argues that the none of the references teach the combination of a doctor element intercepting a curtain that has flowed over a guideblade as claimed. However, as to the suggestion of enclosing the space, the Examiner remains of the position that the references suggest this enclosing for the reasons fully discussed at paragraph 8 of the Office Action of September 19, 2008. This paragraph also provides a discussion of the providing of negative/positive pressure in the space. As to the placement of the pressure differential device, the Examiner remains of the position that the suggestion of providing such a device would be provided by the need to provide positive/negative pressure in the space between the first and second curtains, thus meaning that a device to provide such pressure would need to be present. As to applicant's argument that the wall of Finnicum would teach away from the enclosement step, the wall shows the need for an enclosing means. Finnicum does not limit what the wall 21 can be made of, and the Examiner has provided Nakamura as to the suggestion of having two curtains in series, such that one curtain acts as "rear wall" 21 for the other. As to providing a doctor element intercepting a curtain that has flowed over a guide blade, the Examiner has cited Bulow as to the benefits of using a quideblade; and '129 as to the benefits of the intercepting doctor -- one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly be suggested to provide both features to a curtain to have the combined benefits..